

REMARKS

Claims 1-29 are pending. Claims 7-8, 10, 13 and 24 are amended herein. No new matter is added as a result of the claim amendments.

102 Rejections

The instant Office Actions states that Claims 1-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Kim (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0126752). The Applicants have reviewed the cited reference and respectfully submit that the present invention as recited in Claims 1-29 is not anticipated nor rendered obvious by Kim.

Independent Claim 1 recites that an embodiment in accordance with the present invention is directed to a method that includes “receiving input data comprised of compressed data for a frame of a plurality of frames ...; [and] downsampling said input data to generate compressed downsampled data” (emphasis added). Claims 2-7 are dependent on Claim 1 and recite additional limitations.

Independent Claim 8 recites that an embodiment in accordance with the present invention is directed to a method that includes “selecting data processing functions according to the number of macroblocks characterized as said first coding type and the number of macroblocks characterized as said second coding type, wherein at least one of said processing functions comprises downsampling data in the discrete cosine transform (DCT) domain” (emphasis added). Claims 9-18 are dependent on Claim 8 and recite additional limitations.

Independent Claim 19 recites that an embodiment in accordance with the present invention is directed to a system that includes “a

downsampler coupled to said input buffer, said downsampler adapted to generate compressed downsampled data” (emphasis added). Claims 20-24 are dependent on Claim 19 and recite additional limitations.

Independent Claim 25 recites that an embodiment in accordance with the present invention is directed to a computer-usable medium for performing a method that includes “accessing input data residing in a buffer, said input data comprising compressed data for a frame of a plurality of frames ...; [and] generating compressed downsampled data by downsampling said input data” (emphasis added). Claims 26-29 are dependent on Claim 25 and recite additional limitations.

Applicants respectfully submit that Kim does not show or suggest downsampling compressed data or downsampling data in the DCT domain, as recited in the independent Claims 1, 8, 19 and 25. Kim describes a video pre-processing unit 300 that carries out down-sampling processes (see paragraph [0116] of Kim). The video pre-processing unit 300 of Kim receives data from video decoder 103, which Kim describes as being identical to decoding unit 10 of Kim. The functions performed by decoding unit 103 are described in paragraphs [0007] and [0088] of Kim. Kim describes decoding unit 103 as inverse-quantizing the DCT coefficients to output inverse DCT coefficients. That is, decoding unit 103 decodes (decompresses) the input data and outputs decoded (decompressed) data. The output of decoding unit 103 is provided to video pre-processing unit 300 for downsampling, as mentioned above.

Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that Kim only describes downsampling decompressed data, and that Kim does not show or suggest performing downsampling operations on data while the data are still

compressed, as recited in independent Claims 1, 8, 19 and 25. Applicants respectfully submit that Kim only appears to be an example of a transcoder that decodes (decompresses) an input stream and downsamples the decoded frames, as described in the background art section of the instant application (see page 1, lines 32-36, of the instant application).

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Kim does not show or suggest the embodiments of the present claimed invention recited in independent Claims 1, 8, 19 and 25, and that these claims are considered patentable over Kim. Because Claims 2-7, 9-18, 20-24 and 26-29 depend from either Claim 1, 8, 19 or 25 and contain additional limitations, these claims are also considered patentable over Kim. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the basis for rejecting Claims 1-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is traversed.

Conclusions

In light of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejected claims.

Based on the arguments presented above, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 1-29 overcome the rejections of record and, therefore, Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of these claims.


Applicants have reviewed the references cited but not relied upon. Applicants did not find these references to show or suggest the present claimed invention: U.S. Patent Nos. 5,973,739, 6,704,358, 5,644,361, 6,018,368 and 6,671,322.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Date: 1/21/05



John P. Wagner, Jr.
Reg. No. 35,398

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, California 95113
(408) 938-9060